

I dedicate this book to all people
who have written books. I wrote
this book for the purpose of
writing a book and having a book
published. Do not buy it.

Thanks to every single person whose name starts with J. We could not do this without y'all. That may seem nonsensical and random, but if the collective contributions of people whose name starts with J was undone, we would've gotten rid of a lot of people's contributions to society.

So, this book required the contributions of various people whose name begins with J.

Who are we? Well, we are everything that centered around us. Our bodies, our memories, our thoughts, our opinions, how we identify ourselves to other people, how other people identify us, our membership in groups, our challenges, our pasts, our births, our deaths, our dreams (both literal and figurative), our sleeping patterns, our disabilities or lack thereof, and much, much more. We are everything that we are.

Feeling bad is normal. There is nothing shameful about feeling bad. Oftentimes, people have valid reasons for feeling bad.

However, does that mean we let people continue to feel bad?

Shouldn't we try our hardest to fix the person's problems? Or should we just help people *cope* with it and tell them life ain't fair? Life ain't fair, but that isn't a justification for making that worse or being part of the problem.

Nostalgia, at least how I experience it, is weird. I guess what I feel about nostalgic about is the aesthetics of the past.

Regardless of how bad my life is, there is a lot of aesthetic beauty that I take for granted until time progresses and my aesthetic environment changes. I should really use that realization to change how I view the present.

“Treat others how you would want to be treated” is terrible advice that ignores the fact each person has different needs. We as a society have a bad habit of people's struggles with the line, “but it isn't a problem for *me*” or “if I was in your shoes, I wouldn't care”. People other than you exist and they aren't the same as you.

My body is not a temple. It is me and I should have complete control over me. With the exception of social responsibility (such as the fact vaccination is needed not just to protect yourself, but also other people), people should have complete control over their bodies. Even bad people. Freedom to modify your body can be limited by difficulty accessing the resources needed to do so. That is a violation of bodily autonomy that should be redressed.

If you bought this book, if you have a physical copy of it (and aren't me), I want you to look at yourself. I published this book because I wanted to publish a book for its own sake. A lot of this book is just me vaguebooking about various issues. So, I want you to look at yourself and ask you, are you happy with your decision? I am not trying to mock you. Only you can decide when it comes to questions like this.

What is the point of life? When I ask that question, people counter it with, “Does life need a point?”. I disagree. I can't tell other people how to live their lives, but without a driving motivation (internal and/or social), what exactly are you going to do with your life? Ain't it going to get boring? How can you feel good about yourself if you don't have a standard to compare yourself to? I think I have things that keep me motivated. This isn't me complaining. This is me armchair “philosophizing”.

I think a lot of people need to acquaint themselves with the term “politicization”. Any issue, however trivial or obvious, can become controversial if a significant amount of people want to make it so. It is very common for people, for a various reasons, to dispute objective statements. By objective, I mean falsifiable, backed by evidence, and not a value judgment. We need to defend scientific consensuses from highly motivated individuals who them dispute on political, not scientific, grounds.

While I don't agree with the idea of *tabula rasa* at all, it is interesting how we progress from babies to people who have been shaped by society. Even people who are social non-conformers can only be social non-conformers if they have a societal standard to not conform to. Pain is inherently unpleasant, but none of us is born with the knowledge that stapling your hand will cause pain. We learn that as we grow up (even if it didn't directly happen to us), so we try our best to avoid our hands from being stapled.

I have been told that I don't like people because I often argue with people who have authority. I disagree. I feel like these authority figures are hurting innocent people. I get angry with them more because they are being unjust than that they are hurting me specifically. However, I have learned that I have to pick my battles. Sometimes, there is very little you can do about a situation. You should fight for what's right when you can, but often times, rebellion is viewed as justification for them to be unjust more.

I don't want to be famous or in any way in the public eye. When you are famous or under a lot of scrutiny, you aren't allowed to make mistakes. We all make mistakes. It is an inherent part of learning. But if you are famous, anything you have done or said that was problematic, even if it was minor, in the past, and you've grown as a person, can and will be used against you in a court of public opinion.

The above page should not be seen as me complaining about “political correctness”. We absolutely should be thoughtful about other people's needs, concerns, and opinions. What I am criticizing is social perfectionism. The idea that other people and/or ourselves need to have perfect spotless records of thought and behaviour and if they don't, they are an unforgivable monster.

At the same time, how do we deal with someone who didn't just say something mildly offensive a few years, but has greatly harmed the lives of other people? Not in ways that could result in legal punishment (because people would say that, that's the answer), but still have ruined one or more persons' lives. Can they ever be forgiven? I don't know. I am just someone who has a computer and too much free time on her hands.

After I publish this book, these various thoughts I have will be added to the metaphorical collective library of all literature.

It will be given an ISBN and everything. And this was extremely low effort. My main purpose is to let various thoughts out and publish a book just to publish a book. It isn't primarily about wanting to be famous or people to hear my thoughts. As I said, I don't want that. I don't know. Can you adequately explain everything you feel motivated to do?

People's sense of what is helpful can really messed up. How can y'all claim to help me if y'all oppose everything I am, have been, and ever will be out of hand? Doesn't matter what is or how it makes me feel or how it might benefit society. Y'all automatically view it as wrong. How can y'all view yourselves as on my side? What a joke! But y'all don't question it nor do you listen to me when I (or anyone else) question it.

You may not believe it, but I have occasionally gotten writers' block in the middle of writing this book.

Yes, I am trying to get out thoughts, but not all of them and oftentimes, I don't know how to put the thought onto paper. Yes, a lot of the book is me talking about the book itself, but you made the decision to buy a book that I told you was made for the sole purpose of having a book published.

Even if you are in the middle of an all-encompassing storm, you are still a person with thoughts who does things. Indeed, it is something that you will always be as long as there is a you. So, why should being in a lot of physical and/or mental pain, currently or in the past, be used to delegitimatize your the things you think and do?

This also includes bad actions.

Just because someone did something bad and has a physical or mental illness does not mean the two are related. Pretending they are promotes stigma.

Appeals to hypocrisy are interesting. I would say, generally, hypocrisy *strengthens* a person's argument. I mean, it takes one to know one. If you claim something is bad and you do that thing (or something similar), doesn't mean you have first hand experience with that thing and its effects? We live in a society that fixates too much on people's motivations. It is obviously important, but from a social standpoint, doesn't two similar behaviors done for radically different reasons ultimately have the same effect?

We live our lives in the constant threat of pain. If we fall, we could get hurt and maybe have to go to the hospital. If we say the wrong thing, people could hurt us emotionally. And perhaps the most troubling example of this is that we have to factor in the possibility of being run over by a metal death trap every time we cross the street. It is something we've had to do since we were little children. Why do very few people think about that and why do even fewer want to change it?

I don't think any decision can be random or out of the blue.

Decisions can be impulsive, but all decisions have a history behind them. If a person makes an impulsive decision that ruins their life, that person shouldn't focus on the impulsive decision itself, but also the context. If you ignore the context, you might be doomed to repeat it. As well, it makes it hard to undo the damage of that decision.

I hope you got some insight or enjoyment out of this book if you did decide to buy it. But this ain't much.

I naturally had 23 pages. However, the minimum numbers of pages required to self-publish is 24 pages. Interesting. I got so close, without knowing what the minimum was in the first place.